

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

John B. Campbell,	)	C/A No. 4:12-3317-TLW-TER
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Report and Recommendation
	)	
William Buyer, Director of SCDC; Employees of Perry	)	
Correction; Employees of Lee Correction,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

On November 19, 2012, this case was removed to this court from an action filed in the State of South Carolina, in the Court of Common Pleas in Greenville County.<sup>1</sup> Defendant Buyer<sup>2</sup> filed a motion to dismiss on November 19, 2012. As the Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, the court issued an order on or about September 11, 2012, pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1975), advising Plaintiff of the motion to dismiss procedure and the possible consequences if he failed to respond adequately. Plaintiff failed to file a response.

## **II. RULE 41(B) DISMISSAL**

A complaint may be dismissed pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for failure to prosecute and/or failure to comply with orders of the court. Ballard v. Carlson, 882 F.2d 93 (4th Cir. 1989), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 1084 (1990), and Chandler Leasing Corp. v. Lopez, 669 F.2d 919 (4th Cir. 1982). In considering whether to dismiss an action pursuant to Rule 41(b), the court is

---

<sup>1</sup>All pretrial proceedings in this case were referred to the undersigned pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and (B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), DSC. Because this is a dispositive motion, the report and recommendation is entered for review by the district judge.

<sup>2</sup> It does not appear from the documents filed with this court that any other Defendants besides William Buyer have been served. This report and recommendation applies to the entire case.

required to consider four factors:

- (1) the degree of plaintiff's responsibility in failing to respond;
- (2) the amount of prejudice to the defendant;
- (3) the history of the plaintiff in proceeding in a dilatory manner; and,
- (4) the existence of less drastic sanctions other than dismissal.

Davis v. Williams, 588 F.2d 69 (4th Cir. 1978).

In the present case, the Plaintiff is proceeding pro se so he is entirely responsible for his actions. It is solely through Plaintiff's neglect, and not that of an attorney, that no responses have been filed to this motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff has not responded to Defendant's motion to dismiss or the court's order requiring him to respond. No other reasonable sanctions are available. Accordingly, it is recommended that this action be dismissed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 41(b).

### **III. CONCLUSION**

Based on the above reasoning, it is RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed for failure to prosecute pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 41(b) with prejudice.

Respectfully submitted,

s/Thomas E. Rogers, III  
Thomas E. Rogers, III  
United States Magistrate Judge

January 23, 2013  
Florence, South Carolina

**The parties' attention is directed to the important information on the attached notice.**